

Potpourri, 10

Stephen William Semmes
Rice University
Houston, Texas

Let $(M, d(x, y))$ be a metric space. Thus M is a nonempty set and $d(x, y)$ is a real-valued function defined for $x, y \in M$ such that $d(x, y) \geq 0$ for all $x, y \in M$, $d(x, y) = 0$ if and only if $x = y$, $d(x, y) = d(y, x)$ for all $x, y \in M$, and

$$(1) \quad d(x, z) \leq d(x, y) + d(y, z)$$

for all $x, y, z \in M$. If we have the stronger condition that

$$(2) \quad d(x, z) \leq \max(d(x, y), d(y, z))$$

for all $x, y, z \in M$, then we say that $d(x, y)$ is an *ultrametric* on M .

Of course the real line $\mathbf{R}$ with the standard metric $|x - y|$ is a metric space. We shall discuss some more examples soon.

Let $(M, d(x, y))$ be a metric space, and let E be a subset of M . We say that E is bounded if the collection of real numbers $d(x, y)$, $x, y \in E$ are bounded, and in this event we define the diameter of E by

$$(3) \quad \text{diam } E = \sup\{d(x, y) : x, y \in E\}.$$

The diameter of the empty set is defined to be 0, and we can also define the diameter of an unbounded subset of M to be $+\infty$.

For each $p \in M$ and $r > 0$ define the open and closed balls in M with center p and radius r by

$$(4) \quad B(p, r) = \{x \in M : d(x, p) < r\}$$

and

$$(5) \quad \overline{B}(p, r) = \{x \in M : d(x, p) \leq r\},$$

respectively. Thus

$$(6) \quad B(p, r) \subseteq \overline{B}(p, r)$$

and

$$(7) \quad \text{diam } \overline{B}(p, r) \leq 2r$$

for all $p \in M$ and $r > 0$.

If E is a subset of M and $\mathcal{A}$ is a family of subsets of M , then we say that $\mathcal{A}$ is an *admissible covering* of E if

$$(8) \quad E \subseteq \bigcup_{A \in \mathcal{A}} A$$

and $\mathcal{A}$ has at most countably many elements. In some situations one might wish to restrict one's attention to admissible coverings by bounded subsets of M . One might also be interested in coverings which contain only finitely many subsets of M .

For example, if E is any subset of M , then we can simply cover E by E itself, or by M . If p is any element of M , then the family of balls $B(p, l)$, with l a positive integer, is an admissible covering of any subset of M by bounded subsets of M .

Suppose that $h(t)$ is a monotone increasing continuous real-valued function defined for nonnegative real numbers t such that $h(0) = 0$, $h(t) > 0$ when $t > 0$. Put

$$(9) \quad h(+\infty) = \sup\{h(t) : 0 \leq t < \infty\},$$

which is equal to $+\infty$ if $h(t)$ is unbounded.

If E is any subset of M , then we define $\mu_h(E)$, the Hausdorff content of E relative to the function h , to be the infimum of

$$(10) \quad \sum_{A \in \mathcal{A}} h(\text{diam } A)$$

over all admissible coverings $\mathcal{A}$ of E . As a special case, if α is a positive real number, then we can take $h(t) = t^\alpha$. For this we write $\mu^\alpha(E)$ instead of $\mu_h(E)$, and $\mu^\alpha(E)$ is called the α -dimensional Hausdorff content of E .

Of course $\mu_h(E) \geq 0$ for all subsets E of M , and $\mu_h(E) = 0$ if E is the empty set, or if E contains only one element. Using the trivial covering of E by E we get that

$$(11) \quad \mu_h(E) \leq h(\text{diam } E).$$

In general $\mu_h(E)$ may be equal to $+\infty$ when E is unbounded. If h is unbounded and we restrict ourselves to admissible coverings with only finitely many elements, then the analogue of $\mu_h(E)$ is equal to $+\infty$ when E is unbounded.

If $E, \tilde{E}$ are subsets of M with

$$(12) \quad \tilde{E} \subseteq E,$$

then

$$(13) \quad \mu_h(\tilde{E}) \leq \mu_h(E).$$

If E_1, E_2 are subsets of M , then

$$(14) \quad \mu_h(E_1 \cup E_2) \leq \mu_h(E_1) + \mu_h(E_2).$$

This follows easily by combining arbitrary admissible coverings of E_1, E_2 to get admissible coverings of $E_1 \cup E_2$, and it would also work for the analogue of $\mu_h(E)$ defined using finite coverings of E . If $E_1, E_2, E_3, \dots$ is a sequence of subsets of M , then

$$(15) \quad \mu_h\left(\bigcup_{j=1}^{\infty} E_j\right) \leq \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \mu_h(E_j),$$

because arbitrary admissible coverings of the E_j 's can be combined to give an admissible covering of the union. This uses the fact that a countable union of countable sets is a countable set.

For the analogue of μ_h defined using finite coverings we have in particular that $\mu_h(E) = 0$ when E is a finite set. If we use countable coverings as above then $\mu_h(E) = 0$ when E is at most countable.

Notice that the closure of a bounded subset of a metric space M is also bounded and has the same diameter. Using this one can check that one gets the same result for $\mu_h(E)$ if one restricts one's attention to admissible coverings of E by closed subsets of M .

The same remark applies to the analogue of $\mu_h(E)$ based on finite coverings of E . For this it follows that one gets the same answer for the closure of E as for E . This does not work in general for $\mu_h(E)$ based on coverings which are at most countable.

If A is any subset of M and r is a positive real number, put

$$(16) \quad A(r) = \{x \in M : \text{there is an } a \in A \text{ such that } d(x, a) < r\}.$$

Thus $A \subseteq A(r)$, and one can check that $A(r)$ is always an open subset of M .

If A is a bounded subset of M , then $A(r)$ is bounded too, and one can check that

$$(17) \quad \text{diam } A(r) \leq \text{diam } A + 2r.$$

In the case of an ultrametric we have that the diameter of $A(r)$ is less than or equal to the maximum of the diameter of A and r . Using this one can show that we can restrict ourselves to coverings by open sets and get the same answers for Hausdorff content.

If E is a compact subset of M , then for each open covering of E there is a finite subcovering of E . Thus the versions of $\mu_h(E)$ based on coverings which are finite or at most countable give the same result when E is compact.

Let $\epsilon > 0$ be given, and let E be a subset of M . An admissible covering $\mathcal{A}$ of E in M is called an ϵ -covering if

$$(18) \quad \text{diam } A < \epsilon$$

for all $A \in \mathcal{A}$. If M is a separable metric space, meaning that there is a dense subset of M which is at most countable, then there is an ϵ -covering of M , and hence of any subset of M , for all $\epsilon > 0$.

As a variant of the Hausdorff content associated to $h(t)$, define $\mathcal{H}_{h,\epsilon}(E)$ to be the infimum of $\sum_{A \in \mathcal{A}} h(\text{diam } A)$ over all ϵ -coverings $\mathcal{A}$ of E , if there are any, and otherwise put $\mathcal{H}_{h,\epsilon}(E) = +\infty$. If ϵ_1, ϵ_2 are positive real numbers with $\epsilon_1 \leq \epsilon_2$, then

$$(19) \quad \mathcal{H}_{h,\epsilon_2}(E) \leq \mathcal{H}_{h,\epsilon_1}(E).$$

For all $\epsilon > 0$ we have that

$$(20) \quad \mu_h(E) \leq \mathcal{H}_{h,\epsilon}(E).$$

Just as for Hausdorff content, we can restrict ourselves to ϵ -coverings by open or closed subsets of M and get the same result for $\mathcal{H}_{h,\epsilon}(E)$. If E is a compact subset of M , then $\mathcal{H}_{h,\epsilon}(E)$ is equal to its analogue for finite coverings.

The Hausdorff measure of a subset E of M associated to the function $h(t)$ is defined by

$$(21) \quad \mathcal{H}_h(E) = \sup_{\epsilon > 0} \mathcal{H}_{h,\epsilon}(E).$$

Thus

$$(22) \quad \mu_h(E) \leq \mathcal{H}_{h,\epsilon}(E) \leq \mathcal{H}_h(E)$$

for all $\epsilon > 0$. If α is a positive real number and $h(t) = t^\alpha$, then we write $\mathcal{H}_\epsilon^\alpha(E)$, $\mathcal{H}^\alpha(E)$ in place of $\mathcal{H}_{h,\epsilon}(E)$, $\mathcal{H}_h(E)$.

Notice that $\mathcal{H}_h(E) = 0$ when E is the empty set or E consists of just one element. If $E, \tilde{E}$ are subsets of M and $\tilde{E} \subseteq E$, then $\mathcal{H}_h(\tilde{E}) \leq \mathcal{H}_h(E)$.

If $E_1, E_2, \dots$ are subsets of M , then

$$(23) \quad \mathcal{H}_{h,\epsilon}\left(\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} E_j\right) \leq \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \mathcal{H}_{h,\epsilon}(E_j)$$

for all $\epsilon > 0$, and therefore

$$(24) \quad \mathcal{H}_h\left(\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} E_j\right) \leq \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \mathcal{H}_h(E_j).$$

For the analogue of $\mathcal{H}_h$ based on finite coverings we still have finite subadditivity.

Suppose that E_1, E_2 are subsets of M and that there is an $\eta > 0$ such that $d(x, y) \geq \eta$ for all $x \in E_1$ and all $y \in E_2$. In this event we have that

$$(25) \quad \mathcal{H}_{h,\epsilon}(E_1 \cup E_2) \geq \mathcal{H}_{h,\epsilon}(E_1) + \mathcal{H}_{h,\epsilon}(E_2)$$

for all $\epsilon \in (0, \eta]$. Hence

$$(26) \quad \mathcal{H}_h(E_1 \cup E_2) \geq \mathcal{H}_h(E_1) + \mathcal{H}_h(E_2).$$

Notice that $\mu_h(E) = 0$ for a subset E of M if and only if for each $\eta > 0$ there is an admissible covering $\mathcal{A}$ of E such that

$$(27) \quad \sum_{A \in \mathcal{A}} h(A) < \eta.$$

This implies that $\mathcal{H}_h(E) = 0$, since the diameters of the covering sets A have to be small anyway.

Let us consider the special case where M is the real line with the standard metric. For this we can restrict ourselves to coverings by intervals in the definitions of Hausdorff measure and Hausdorff content, since every subset of the real line is contained in an interval with the same diameter. We can allow unbounded intervals such as the real line itself to accommodate unbounded subsets of the real line.

If a, b are real numbers with $a \leq b$, let $[a, b]$ be the usual closed interval with endpoints a, b , consisting of the real numbers x such that $a \leq x \leq b$. Recall that this is a compact subset of the real line.

Clearly

$$(28) \quad \mu^1([a, b]) \leq b - a.$$

For each $\epsilon > 0$ we can cover $[a, b]$ by finitely many closed intervals, each of length less than ϵ , and so that the sum of their lengths is equal to $b - a$, which implies that

$$(29) \quad \mathcal{H}_\epsilon^1([a, b]) \leq b - a$$

and therefore

$$(30) \quad \mathcal{H}^1([a, b]) \leq b - a.$$

Conversely,

$$(31) \quad \mu^1([a, b]) \geq b - a.$$

This reduces to the observation that if $I_1, \dots, I_l$ are intervals in the real line such that

$$(32) \quad [a, b] \subseteq I_1 \cup \dots \cup I_l,$$

then $b - a$ is less than or equal to the sum of the lengths of the I_j 's. In summary we have that

$$(33) \quad \mathcal{H}^1([a, b]) = \mu^1([a, b]) = b - a.$$

Let $X_1, X_2, \dots$ be a sequence of finite sets, where each X_j has $n_j \geq 2$ elements, and let X denote the space of sequences $x = \{x_j\}_{j=1}^\infty$ with $x_j \in X_j$ for each j . For each nonnegative integer l and each $x \in X$ let $N_l(x)$ be the set of $y \in X$ such that the j th terms of x and y are equal when $j \leq l$. These “neighborhoods” of points in X generate a topology for X in the usual way, in which a subset U of X is open if for each $x \in U$ there is an $l \geq 0$ such that $N_l(x) \subseteq U$. If $x, y \in X$ and $y \in N_l(x)$, then $N_l(y) = N_l(x)$, as one can easily see, and thus $N_l(x)$ is an open subset of X .

Let us call a subset of X of the form $N_l(x)$ for some $x \in X$ and $l \geq 0$ a cell. Thus cells are open subsets of X , and one can check that they are also closed, because the complement of a cell can be expressed as a union of cells. With this topology X becomes a compact Hausdorff space which is totally disconnected, which is to say that X does not contain any connected subsets with more than one element. If $\mathcal{C}_1, \mathcal{C}_2$ are cells in X , then either $\mathcal{C}_1 \subseteq \mathcal{C}_2$, or $\mathcal{C}_2 \subseteq \mathcal{C}_1$, or $\mathcal{C}_1 \cap \mathcal{C}_2 = \emptyset$. We can be more precise and say that if $x, y \in X$ and l, p are nonnegative integers with $l \leq p$, then either $N_p(y) \subseteq N_l(x)$ or $N_l(x) \cap N_p(y) = \emptyset$.

Suppose that $\{r_l\}_{l=0}^\infty$ is a strictly decreasing sequence of positive real numbers such that $\lim_{l \rightarrow \infty} r_l = 0$. Define a distance function on X by saying that the distance from x to y , $x, y \in X$ is equal to 0 when $x = y$ and to r_l when the j th terms of x, y are equal for $j \leq l$ and different for $j = l + 1$. With respect to this distance function, $N_l(x)$ is the same as the set of $y \in X$ whose distance to x is less than or equal to r_l . This defines an ultrametric on X compatible with the topology generated by these standard neighborhoods in X .

If A is a subset of X , then there is a cell in X which contains A and which has the same diameter as A , and therefore one may restrict one's attention to admissible coverings by cells in X in the definition of the Hausdorff content or Hausdorff measure of a subset of X . Of course

$$(34) \quad \mu_h(\mathcal{C}) \leq h(r_l)$$

for any cell $\mathcal{C}$ in X of diameter r_l . If $p > l$, then $\mathcal{C}$ is the union of

$$(35) \quad \prod_{i=l+1}^p n_i$$

cells of diameter r_p . Hence

$$(36) \quad \mathcal{H}_{h,\epsilon}(\mathcal{C}) \leq \left(\prod_{i=l+1}^p n_i \right) h(r_p)$$

when $r_p < \epsilon$.

A particularly nice situation occurs when the function $h(t)$ satisfies

$$(37) \quad h(r_l) = n_l h(r_{l+1})$$

for all $l \geq 0$. In this event we get that

$$(38) \quad \mathcal{H}_h(\mathcal{C}) \leq h(r_l)$$

for any cell $\mathcal{C}$ in X with diameter r_l . Moreover,

$$(39) \quad \mu_h(\mathcal{C}) \geq h(r_l)$$

under these conditions. This is because any finite covering of $\mathcal{C}$ can be refined to a covering of cells of the same diameter, and any covering of $\mathcal{C}$ by cells of diameter r_p , $p \geq l$, has to include all of the cells contained in $\mathcal{C}$ of diameter r_p . If the n_j 's are all equal to some positive integer n and $r_l = r^l$ for some $r \in (0, 1)$, then we can take

$$(40) \quad h(t) = t^\alpha$$

where

$$(41) \quad n r^\alpha = 1.$$

More generally, suppose that $(M, d(x, y))$ is a metric space with $d(x, y)$ an ultrametric. Let p_1, p_2 be elements of M , and let $r_1 \leq r_2$ be positive real numbers. If

$$(42) \quad B(p_1, r_1) \cap B(p_2, r_2) \neq \emptyset,$$

then

$$(43) \quad B(p_1, r_1) \subseteq B(p_2, r_2).$$

Similarly, if

$$(44) \quad \overline{B}(p_1, r_1) \cap \overline{B}(p_2, r_2) \neq \emptyset,$$

then

$$(45) \quad \overline{B}(p_1, r_1) \subseteq \overline{B}(p_2, r_2).$$

The diameter of a ball of radius r in M is less than or equal to r .

One can check that every open ball in M is a closed subset of M . Also, every closed ball in M is an open subset of M . In particular, M is totally disconnected.

In our space X as before, it is natural to say that a cell of the form $N_l(x)$ should have measure equal to 1 when $l = 0$, and to

$$(46) \quad \frac{1}{\prod_{i=1}^l n_i}$$

when $l > 0$. In this way the cells of the same diameter have the same measure.

Let l be a nonnegative integer, and let E_l be a subset of X such that E_l contains exactly one element from each of the cells in X of diameter r_l . If f is a continuous real-valued function on X , then we can associate to f the Riemann sum

$$(47) \quad \frac{1}{\prod_{i=1}^l n_i} \sum_{x \in E_l} f(x).$$

The integral of f can be defined as a limit of Riemann sums as $l \rightarrow \infty$. Recall that because X is compact, f is automatically uniformly continuous on X . This implies that the Riemann sums converge and are independent of the choices of the E_l 's.

If $\mathcal{C}$ is a cell in X , then the function on X equal to 1 on $\mathcal{C}$ and to 0 on the complement of $\mathcal{C}$ in X is a continuous function on X . The integral of this function is equal to the measure of the cell as defined before. Basically we simply have a probability distribution on X which is uniformly distributed at each step in the obvious way.

If $(M, d(x, y))$ and $(N, \rho(u, v))$ are metric spaces, then a mapping $f : M \rightarrow N$ is said to be C -Lipschitz for some $C \geq 0$ if

$$(48) \quad \rho(f(x), f(y)) \leq C d(x, y)$$

for all $x, y \in M$. This is equivalent to saying that for each bounded subset A of M , $f(A)$ is a bounded subset of N with diameter less than or equal to C times the diameter of A in M . In this case, if $h(t)$ is a function on $[0, \infty)$ as before and $\tilde{h}(t) = h(C^{-1}t)$, then for each subset E of M we have that the Hausdorff content of $f(E)$ in N with respect to $\tilde{h}$ is less than or equal to the Hausdorff content of E in M with respect to h . Similarly, $\mathcal{H}_{\tilde{h}, C\epsilon}^\infty(f(E))$ in N is less than or equal to $\mathcal{H}_{h, \epsilon}^\infty(E)$ in M for all $\epsilon > 0$. As a consequence, $\mathcal{H}_h^\infty(f(E))$ in N is less than or equal to $\mathcal{H}_h^\infty(E)$ in M .

A real-valued function $f(x)$ on M is C -Lipschitz if and only if

$$(49) \quad f(x) \leq f(y) + C d(x, y)$$

for all $x, y \in M$. For each $p \in M$ we have that $f_p(x) = d(x, p)$ is 1-Lipschitz. More generally, if A is a nonempty subset of M , then

$$(50) \quad \text{dist}(x, A) = \inf\{d(x, y) : y \in A\}$$

is 1-Lipschitz. If the 1-dimensional Hausdorff content of M is equal to 0, then the same must be true of the image of any real-valued Lipschitz function on M . In particular, M must be totally disconnected.

Let $\phi(t)$ be a monotone increasing continuous real-valued function defined for nonnegative real numbers t such that $\phi(0) = 0$ and $\phi(t) > 0$ when $t > 0$. If $(M, d(x, y))$ is a metric space and $d(x, y)$ is actually an ultrametric on M , then $\phi(d(x, y))$ is also an ultrametric on M which defines the same topology as $d(x, y)$. In particular, this works when $\phi(t) = t^a$ for some $a > 0$.

Now assume further that $\phi(t)$ is subadditive, so that

$$(51) \quad \phi(x + y) \leq \phi(x) + \phi(y)$$

for all $x, y \geq 0$. This implies that $\phi(t)$ is uniformly continuous under these conditions. Namely,

$$(52) \quad \phi(x) \leq \phi(x + r) \leq \phi(x) + \phi(r),$$

so that uniform continuity follows from continuity at 0. If $(M, d(x, y))$ is a metric space, then $\phi(d(x, y))$ is a metric on M which defines the same topology as $d(x, y)$ does. If $0 < a \leq 1$, then $\phi(t) = t^a$ satisfies these conditions.

In either of these two situations, if A is a bounded subset of M with respect to $d(x, y)$, then A is bounded with respect to $\phi(d(x, y))$. The diameter of A with respect to $\phi(d(x, y))$ is equal to ϕ of the diameter of A with respect to $d(x, y)$.

References

- [1] T. Bedford, M. Keane, and C. Series, editors, *Ergodic Theory, Symbolic Dynamics, and Hyperbolic Spaces*, Oxford University Press, 1991.
- [2] J. Cassels, *Local Fields*, Cambridge University Press, 1986.
- [3] R. Coifman and G. Weiss, *Analyse Harmonique Non-Commutative sur Certains Espaces Homogènes*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics **242**, Springer-Verlag, 1971.
- [4] R. Coifman and G. Weiss, *Extensions of Hardy Spaces and their Use in Analysis*, Bulletin of the American Mathematical Society **83** (1977), 569–645.
- [5] M. Coornaert and A. Papadopoulos, *Symbolic Dynamics and Hyperbolic Groups*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics **1539**, Springer-Verlag, 1993.
- [6] K. Falconer, *The Geometry of Fractal Sets*, Cambridge University Press, 1986.

- [7] H. Federer, *Geometric Measure Theory*, Springer-Verlag, 1969.
- [8] M. Garey and D. Johnson, *Computers and Intractability: A Guide to the Theory of NP-Completeness*, Freeman, 1979.
- [9] R. Goldberg, *Methods of Real Analysis*, 2nd edition, Macmillan, 1976.
- [10] F. Gouvêa, *p-Adic Numbers: An Introduction*, 2nd edition, Springer-Verlag, 1997.
- [11] P. Halmos, *Lectures on Boolean Algebras*, Springer-Verlag, 1974.
- [12] E. Hewitt and K. Stromberg, *Real and Abstract Analysis*, Springer-Verlag, 1975.
- [13] J. Hocking and G. Young, *Topology*, Dover, 1988.
- [14] J. Hopcroft and J. Ullman, *Introduction to Automata Theory, Languages, and Computation*, Addison-Wesley, 1979.
- [15] W. Hurewicz and H. Wallman, *Dimension Theory*, Princeton University Press, 1941.
- [16] F. Jones, *Lebesgue Integration on Euclidean Space*, Jones and Bartlett Publishers, 1993.
- [17] J.-L. Journé, *Calderón–Zygmund Operators, Pseudodifferential Operators and the Cauchy Integral of Calderón*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics **994**, Springer-Verlag, 1983.
- [18] S. Krantz, *Real Analysis and Foundations*, CRC Press, 1991.
- [19] S. Krantz, *A Panorama of Harmonic Analysis*, Mathematical Association of America, 1999.
- [20] H. Lewis and C. Papadimitriou, *Elements of the Theory of Computation*, 2nd edition, Prentice-Hall, 1998.
- [21] D. Lind and B. Marcus, *An Introduction to Symbolic Dynamics and Coding*, Cambridge University Press, 1995.
- [22] J. Luukkainen and H. Movahedi-Lankarani, *Minimal bi-Lipschitz embedding dimension of ultrametric spaces*, *Fundamenta Mathematicae* **144**, 181–193.
- [23] P. Mattila, *Geometry of Sets and Measures in Euclidean Spaces: Fractals and Rectifiability*, Cambridge University Press, 1995.
- [24] C. Papadimitriou, *Computational Complexity*, Addison-Wesley, 1994.
- [25] H. Royden, *Real Analysis*, 3rd edition, Macmillan, 1988.
- [26] W. Rudin, *Principles of Mathematical Analysis*, 3rd edition, McGraw-Hill, 1976.

- [27] W. Rudin, *Real and Complex Analysis*, 3rd edition, McGraw-Hill, 1987.
- [28] M. Sipser, *Introduction to the Theory of Computation*, PWS Publishing Company, 1997.
- [29] E. Stein, *Singular Integrals and Differentiability Properties of Functions*, Princeton University Press, 1970.
- [30] E. Stein, *Harmonic Analysis: Real-Variable Methods, Orthogonality, and Oscillatory Integrals*, with the assistance of T. Murphy, Princeton University Press, 1993.
- [31] E. Stein and R. Shakarchi, *Probability Theory*, to appear, Princeton University Press.
- [32] D. Stroock, *Probability Theory: An Analytic View*, Cambridge University Press, 1993.
- [33] M. Taibleson, *Fourier Analysis on Local Fields*, Princeton University Press, 1975.
- [34] R. Wheeden and A. Zygmund, *Measure and Integral: An Introduction to Real Analysis*, Marcel Dekker, 1977.
- [35] A. Zygmund, *Trigonometric Series*, 3rd edition, Cambridge University Press, 2002.